DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 310 490 EA 021 055

AUTHOR Hallinger, Philip; Richardson, Don
TITLE Models of Shared Leadership: Evolving Structures and Relationships.
PUB DATE Apr 88
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 5-9, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Advisory Committees; Decision Making; Elementary Secondary Education; *Management Teams; *Participative Decision Making; *School Based Management; Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Participation

ABSTRACT

Current reform efforts, focusing on teacher empowerment, are based on the belief that lasting school improvement will occur when teachers become more involved in professional decision-making at the school site. Presented in this document are four conceptually distinct models of teacher involvement in schoolwide decision-making, identified on the basis of a review of previous research as well as field experience; these models are discussed in relation to purpose, the role of teachers and the principal, and potential impact on teacher leadership and empowerment. The first model, the Principals' Advisory Council, has been designed to improve the school's organizational climate through the involvement of a representative group of faculty in the decision-making process. The second model, the Instructional Support Team, is intended to bring about instructional improvement within a specific curricular domain, thus representing significant potential for expanding teacher instructional leadership within the school and empowering teachers within a limited sphere. The third model, the School Improvement Team, increases teachers' professional power, but does not have a direct impact on the classroom. And the fourth model, the Leader Teacher Committee, currently limited to prescriptive proposals and contractual agreements, has been designed to improve educational outcomes for children by increasing use of professional staff expertise and by widening accountability within the school site beyond the principal. (31 references) (KM)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED310490

# Models of Shared Leadership: Evolving Structures and Relationships

Philip Hallinger
Westchester Principals' Center

and

Don Richardson
Westchester Principals' Center

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Philip J. Hallinger

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April 1988

EA 021 055



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Following the issuance of A Nation at Risk in 1983, state education agencies throughout the United States passed legislation intended to reform American schools. These top-down measures were, for the most part, aimed at raising educational standards, both for students and for teachers. These state initiatives have been criticized, particularly for their underlying assumption concerning the nature of teaching. As one critic of state reform has noted, "technocratic policy-makers, engineers at heart, assume that teacher change occurs when the carrot is just out of the donkey's reach and a thick board whistles an inch from its rump" (Cuban, 1984).

Critics of this so-called "school reform by remote control" initiated a second wave of reform, marked by the publication of the Carnegie Report in 1986. In this document a different perspective was taken as regards the profession of teaching and school reform. A basic assumption of most second wave reform efforts has been that lasting school improvement will occur when teachers become more involved in professional decision making at the school site. This assumption has spawned renewed debate over the roles of teachers and principals in decision making and leadership at the school site. Consequently, some school districts (e.g., Dade County, FL; Rochester, NY; Hammond, IN; Toledo, OH) have begun to experiment with new forms of school organization which result in expanded leadership responsibilities for teachers. Although discussions about the relative merits of different forms of school organization tend to focus on the desirability of developing a more professional role for teachers, the rationale for these reforms remains the improvement of learning conditions for students.

The implications of the emerging teacher leadership roles for school administrators is not always clear. Research on effective schools (Shoemaker & Fraser, 1982) and program implementation (Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982) finds that strong instructional leadership, usually on the part of the principal, is strongly associated with school and program effectiveness. Yet, numerous barriers based in the nature of the school organization and in the training of principals limit the ability of most principals to effectively carry out this role (Cuban, 1987; Murphy et al., 1987). In the absence of strong instructional leadership on the part of the principal, proponents of teacher professionalism and empowerment suggest that teachers fill the vacuum and provide the needed direction for educational improvement. This has, in turn, touched off debate among teachers and principals as to both the evolving role definitions of teachers and administrators and potential changes in power and authority relationships at the school site.

This paper attempts to gauge potential changes in power relationships among teachers and principals under four emerging forms of structured teacher involvement in school-wide decision making. In part two of the paper, we examine sources of power in organizations and factors that influence the ability to obtain and use power. In part three, we describe key features of four models of structured teacher involvement in school-wide decision making: the Principals' Advisory Council, Instructional Support Team, School Improvement Team, Lead Teacher Committee. In part four, we discuss these models in terms of their potential impact on: 1) power relationships in the school, and 2) the provision of effective instructional leadership. We conclude with some brief comments regarding the implications of this analysis for school reform.

## Power in Organizations

While teachers often assume that administrators have "the power" to get things done, it is often the case that principals lack either the formal or informal authority to make or implement decisions. In some instances, the principal may lack the formal authority to make a decision that other assume he/she can make. In other cases, administrators may possess the formal authority to make a decision, but lack the informal influence to see that it is implemented. Research in schools has found that principals'rely more upon expert power (i.e., technical knowledge and skills) and referent power (i.e., personal relationships) to get things done, than upon the positional authority that comes with their role as school leader (Guditus & Zirkel, 1979-80).

Numerous researchers examining schools have found that decisions made at upper levels may have little or no effect on participants at lower levels (March 1978; Weick, 1982). Other researchers studying the implementation of innovations find that reforms mandated through the use of formal authority are shaped by the participants at the point of implementation (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978; McLaughlin & Marsh, 1978). These findings have led to the explicit differentiation between decision making and decision implementation. Although none of these researchers explicitly analyzed schools in terms of power relationships, embedded within their findings is an implicit acceptance of the notion that lower level participants in organizations -- in this case teachers -- exert influence on those who wield formal authority.

Sources of organizational power. There is a fairly rich tradition in general studies of organizations of the influence exerted by lower level participants on supervisors. These studies, making an explicit differentiation between formal and informal authority, focus on the use of informal power by subordinates to influence the behavior of those vested with formal authority. Research and theory on the use of power in organizations suggests that there are a different sources of organizational power; legitimate, or formally delegated, power is but one of those sources.

The power of various organizational actors differs in relation to their access to these sources of power. Kanter (1979) asserts that the ability to exercise productive power is dependent upon one's access to: 1) resources and information, and 2) the ability to get cooperation in doing what's necessary. Kanter (1979) draws attention to the fact that power inside the organization as a whole, or within units of the organization, is determined in part by, "connections with other parts of the system". Teachers have traditionally been disconnected from other parts of the system, whether that system consists of teachers in other classrooms, other schools, or the central office. Thus, the development of productive power among teachers should involve providing greater opportunities to obtain useful information (e.g., about instruction, students, the school's needs) and resources (e.g., skills) in order to address issues and problems with others in the larger system.

These sources of power represent leverage points within organizations upon which the generation and use of power depends. Those who have access to resources, expertise, and information are more likely to be able to

exercise power, even when their legitimate authority is limited. Of course, those holding positions of legitimate authority are also more likely to have access to other sources of organizational power.

Mechanic (1962) in his analysis of the sources of power of lower level participants in organizations focuses on the dependence relationships which characterize the exercise of power. He identifies the control of access to information, people or instrumentalities (i.e., the organization's resources or technology) as sources of power. Mechanic suggests that the exercise of power is also connected to the ability to make others dependent:

> The most effective way for lower participants to achieve power is to obtain, maintain, and control access to persons, information and instrumentalities. To the extent that this can be accomplished, lower participants make higher ranking articipants dependent upon them. Thus dependence together with the manipulation of the dependency relationship is the key to power of lower participants (Mechanic, 1962, p. 35).

A major impetus of the movement to "empower" teachers is the assumption that teachers are powerless to make important educational decisions, particularly those concerning the organization as a whole, within the traditional organizational structure of schools. According to current reformers (see Carnegie, 1986) this has two important effects. 1) This powerlessness among teachers degrades the professional status of teachers making it a less stimulating and attractive career. 2) The ineffective utilization of the professional expertise of teachers results in an inadequate educational program and poor performance among students. Theoretically, changes in the organizational structure of schools designed to "empower" teachers and improve student learning should increase teachers' access to the above noted sources of power (e.g., access to resources, information, expertise etc.).

Kanter (1979) elaborated upon these sources of power by identifying factors associated with power or powerlessness in organizations. These factors include traditional sociological conditions such as task focus, variety and interdependence, patterns of participation, reward system, and contact with others across the organizational system. We have adapted Kanter's framework, applying the factors associated with power or powerlessness to the traditional and non-traditional roles of teachers (see Figure One).

It appears from an inspection of Figure One that the traditional teacher role generates powerlessness and dependency on most of the factors specified in Kanter's model. Emerging organizational models for promoting greater teacher leadership and involvement in school-wide decision making should have an impact on the various factors within this framework. In the next section of this paper, we will describe four models of teacher involvement in school-wide decision making. Kanter's framework of organizational power will be used to compare the potential impact of each model on the empowerment of teachers and change in schools as organizations.

Figure 1
Ways Organizational Factors Contribute to
the Power or Powerlessness of Teachers and Principals

| Factors | Generates Power When Factor is | Generates Powerlessness When Factor is | Traditional Teacher Role |
|---|---|---|---|
| Rules Inherent in Job | few | many | moderate |
| Established Routines | few | many | many |
| Task Variety | high | low | low |
| Rewards for predicatability | few | many | moderate |
| Rewards for Unusual Performance | many | few | few |
| Flexibility around use of People | high | low | low |
| Approvals needed for Nonroutine Decisions | few | many | few |
| Publicity About Job Activities | high | low | low |
| Relation of Tasks to Current Problem Areas | central | peripheral | peripheral |
| Focus of Tasks | outside work work unit | inside work unit | inside work unit |
| Interpersonal Contact on Job | high | low | low |
| Contact with Senior Officials | high | low | low |
| Participation in Programs Conferences & Meetings | high | low | low |
| Participation in Problem-solving Task Forces | high | low | low |

(Adapted from Kanter, 1979)

## Four Organizational Models of Teacher Involvement in School-wide Decision Making

Drawing on a review of previous research as well as field experience, we were able to identify four conceptually distinct models of teacher involvement in school-wide decision making:

1) Principal's Advisory Council,
2) Instructional Support Team,
3) School Improvement Team,
4) Lead Teacher Committee.

While these models have been developed conceptually, they vary in the degree to which they have been implemented and evaluated in field settings. Our descriptions are based upon a review of research, field reports, and proposals, as well as our experience. Three of the models are known in current practice: 1) the Principal's Advisory Council, 2) the Instructional Support Team, and 3) the School Improvement Team. The Lead Teacher Committee is the newest concept, gaining national attention in the Carnegie Report and in recently negotiated contracts in Rochester, NY, Hammond, IN and Dade County FL. Not coincidentally, this model entails the most significant change among the four in the structure of school governance and in the resulting relationships among professional staff.

In this section, each model is defined and described in terms of:

1) purpose;
2) the role of teachers and the principal within the model;
3) the potential impact of the model on teacher leadership and empowerment.

The potential impact is assessed, not through analysis of empirical data, but through the application of a conceptual framework of organizational power. It is hoped that this conceptual analysis will clarify some of the issues and focus discussion on the necessary attributes of organizational models which involve teachers in school-wied decision making.

### Principals Advisory Council

Purpose. The Principals' Advisory Council (PAC), also known at times as a Building Liaison Committee, is designed to improve the organizational climate in a school through the involvement of a representative group of faculty in the decision making process. In the PAC model, a group of elected faculty members provide an advisory function for the building principal. The PAC can take up any issue that concerns its members and the administration. Though the range of issues addressed by the PAC can be quite broad, PAC's tend to focus on the policy and management domain. Issues addressed by the PAC might range from getting a new copy machine to proposing changes in the master schedule.

Teacher and principal roles. Advisory Councils are generally formed under the leadership of the principal. That is, although members of a PAC may be elected by the staff, and the PAC is often chaired by a teacher, the principal must place his/her authority behind it for a council to form. On

occasion, a PAC may be defined in the negotiated contract with the Board of Education. Representatives are elected to the Advisory Council by the staff at large. The PAC elects its chairperson and sets its agenda. The principal is an ex-offico member and contributes to the agenda.

The PAC meets regularly and publishes its agenda ahead of time with an invitation for anyone to attend PAC meetings. There must be regular communication with the entire staff. Monthly staff meetings afford time for PAC reports and teacher led discussions. The principal clarifies those topics concerning which the faculty role is advisory and those on which the staff has final decision. Periodic attention is given to goal setting and feedback. Consideration for provision of time and other support resources must be given for the most significant work of the PAC. Training for PAC members and administrators must be provided defining who makes what decision, communication skills and school leadership issues.

The decision making authority of the PAC is, as connoted in the title, advisory. Unless specifically authorized by the principal, the committee makes recommendations to the principal. Seldom, if ever, does the superintendent or school board officially vest the PAC with authority. Authority for decisions in certain areas may be ceded by the principal to the PAC, but the accountability of the principal remains an underlying assumption of the PAC model. That is, ultimately formal authority for school level decisions remains at the level of school accountability, the principal. Formal power ceded by the principal to the PAC is at his/her discretion, and may be withdrawn at his/her discretion. As a member of a functioning group, however, principal is under considerable degree of pressure to use influence over the PAC rather than his/her formal authority with respect to decision making. Conversely, the PAC provides a forum in which teachers can, as a group, exert influence over the principal through the use of legitimated, albeit limited, power.

Potential impact on teacher. Despite the fact that this model of teacher involvement in school decision making is not new, relatively few researchers have studied either the process or products of the PAC in action. In one study it was found that:

> There is general agreement that the faculty should have a role in determining school policies, that the PAC performs an important and unique function at Valhalla High School and strong agreement that the PAC has affected school climate. Respondents report that generally the PAC deals with important matters, works to affect policy in ways beneficial to the respondents, and contributes effectively to monthly faculty meetings. Several teachers commented that the level of faculty complaints decreased directly as the PAC became more effective (Trumbull 1987).

Thus, the PAC can promote a better working climate at the school through regular, formal consideration of issues of concern to teachers. The PAC is most valued as it gathers information and negotiates between different viewpoints, including the viewpoints of various teachers and those of the administration. The ongoing functioning of the PAC allows the diffusion of tension before personnel become aggravated and ultimately unhappy with some aspects of their working day. The importance of the principal's attitude was indicated by one comment,

The principal listens to teachers, who play a vital role in decision making in the school. Teachers' professional skills are being utilized.

As a result of its managerial and policy focus, the PAC tends not to affect the technical core of the school. As Trumbull (1987) concluded "policies relating to instructional matters do not appear on this list....This area of decision making is dealt with by other groups in the school." This is a limitation of the PAC as a model that directly influences student learning.

In the same study, some respondents felt that the PAC had been less effective on a variety of different concerns because changes needed would require either more money or policy changes from the district administration or the Board of Education. Thus, a second limitation of the PAC is the scope of its authority. Even though PAC recommendations are subject to administrative approval, it is clear that the existence of this active and representative faculty group does give teachers an important voice in the affairs of the school. The PAC, as a body that fosters communication and open deliberation, functions in a hierarchical system because of the commitment of particular individuals.

The scope of the PAC's purview and its dependence on the principal's good will and option to delegate his/her authority make it a somewhat limited vehicle for empowering teachers. An effectively functioning PAC can have a significant impact on the school. Teachers assume greater influence through expanded access to information, and through increased opportunities for participation in meetings and problem solving task forces. The PAC does not explicitly address the task focus or variety of professional staff, flexibility around the use of people, the reward structure, or publicity about job activities. An implication of this conclusion is that the PAC does not provide a significant vehicle for addressing the central problem faced by schools: the need for stronger instructional leadership and improved learning opportunities for students.

Instructional Support Team

Purpose. As observed by Guilkey and Amado (1984), "the main purpose for establishing instructional support teams [is] to improve instruction by increasing school-site leadership and teamwork between administration and teachers." Thus, the goal of the Instructional Support Team (IST) model is instructional improvement within specified curricular or interdisciplinary domains.

Although these purposes suggest a focus on teachers, there is an implicit assumption that the instructional support team exists to improve learning conditions for students. Thus, this model of teacher involvement in school decision making represents a method of generating greater instructional leadership by drawing upon the expertise of teachers in the instructional domain. The Instructional Support Team has also been referred to as a community of learners. This connotes the high level of professional interaction which takes place among teachers who share the same students within the team.

Roles of teachers and the principal. The IST consists of an interdisciplinary staff and works on a collegial basis. Team members have three primary responsibilities: diagnosing and solving learning problems encountered with students, curricular coordination, and instructional improvement. Members may volunteer or be appointed by the principal.

Unlike a curriculum committee the instructional support team meets regularly on school time and has ongong responsibilities. A given team has responsibility for an area of the school program, e.g. a core curriculum, special education, a fusion curriculum, a gifted program, a middle school program, a primary school program or independent study. An instructional support team meets at least several times a week on school time to share information and observations about the students served and to coordinate curriculum.

The functioning of the instructional support team is designed to support the daily work of teaching. It raises the frequency of professional interaction among staff and focuses attention on the needs of students. It provides a structure for building professional improvement into the fabric of the school since these meetings represent opportunities to discuss the practice of teaching. The teams also provide a forum in which new teachers are socialized to positive school norms and receive regular support. Participation in a team can build commitment to the profession and stimulate and sustain close mutual examination of teaching as school-wide norm.

The use of an IST is usually built on a foundation of school-wide goals. The functioning of the teams is designed to support and sustain those goals in the life of the school. Principals affect the Instructional Support Team by the message they convey to the faculty about the importance of the team, by direct involvement with the team, by relying on the team for advice, ideas and assistance and by selecting team members.

Potential impact on teachers. A study of school-level Instructional Support Teams at the elementary and secondary levels was conducted by Little and Long (1985) at the Far West Laboratory. Each team was provided with on-site staff training in classroom management and effective instruction. Team members provide coaching to other teachers employing techniques of classroom observation and feedback. Team members assume a lead role in implementing curriculum development objectives formulated in a school-site plan.

Little and Long (1985) found that participation in the Instructional Support Teams fostered shared responsibility for the quality of the school program, reduced teacher isolation and expanded the capacity for leadership within the school. The authors concluded:

> We encountered widespread support at every level for the assumptions and aspirations that undergird the instructional support teams. Criticisms of the teams revolve not around whether the basic ideas are sound, but around how they should be pursued. Basic goals are widely shared, while strategy is a matter of considerable debate.

Thus, under optimal conditions, this model results in different form of impact on teachers and the principal from that of the PAC. The primary different consists of the IST's mission of instructional improvement. The instructional focus provided by the team increases teacher leadership over

key aspects of the educational program of the school, though again this is not sanctioned through formally delegated authority. Through the IST, teachers are able to increase task variety, adapt task focus with greater flexibility, provide more opportunities for interpersonal interaction. problem-solving, and relate tasks more specifically to current problems in the school. Thus, this model represents significant potential for expanding teacher instructional leadership within the school and empowering teachers within a limited sphere.

School Improvement Team

Purpose. The school improvement team (SIT) is a school site council representative of the staff that works with the principal to lead improvement/development activities. The expressed purpose of the SIT is to improve learning opportunities for students by involving teachers in setting school-wide goals and by increasing the coordination among classroom teachers. Thus, like the instructional support team, the SIT model focuses explicitly on involving teachers more systematically in the decision making process of the school as it relates to teaching and learning. The school improvement model is based on the premise that schools can become more effective by opening up the decision-making/influence process.

Role of teachers and the principal. The SIT is often elected by the professional staff, but may also include some representatives appointed by the principal. In some schools it is chaired by the principal; in others, it is chaired by a teacher. The SIT may include non-professional staff as well as teachers and other professional staff. In any of the above cases, the principal plays an active leadership role, though the nature and degree of his/her influence may vary.

The SIT is responsible for guiding the school's educational program. It is an ongoing body which meets regularly. Time and resources are generally provided to make it possible for teachers to meet outside of their normal teaching hours. Its functions include establishing a mission for the school, setting annual school-wide goals, collecting and analyzing needs assessment data from staff and the community, defining improvement priorities and programs, determining responsibilities for program implementation, and evaluating the results of the improvement effort. Thus, the SIT plays a major role in coordinating the educational program of the school. Although, principal leadership is a key to the success of this model, the SIT as a unit is structured so that the staff as a whole plays a more active instructional leadership role in the school program.

The principal and other administrators make a commitment to the process and become informed and trained as to the skills and procedures involved. Administrative commitment is made to goal setting, high task orientation, frequent feedback on performance, high levels of employee discretion, a stress on teamwork, positive relations between management and staff, adequate resources and effective leadership. Through the more formal professional interaction around issues of curriculum and instruction, management increases its understanding and sensitivity to working relationships and conditions.

For the School Improvement Team to work most effectively, teacher input and support is needed to bring about changes in policy and practices. In order to implement such changes, teachers need opportunities to learn new skills, work with their peers and develop a sense of commitment to the new programs. Teachers must see improvements as feasible, given their workload, and helpful in providing better instruction. (McCarthy, 1982)

Impact on teachers. The decision making authority of the School Improvement Team will vary from district to district. At times the development of a school improvement team will come about as a result of a district-wide or even state initiative (e.g., California). It is the model most frequently associated with school-based management. In such cases, the authority of the team is made explicit through school board policy or a legislative act. The SIT is often given authority over the allocation and expenditure of a certain amount of funds. This solidifies its authority and differentiates this model from the previous models in which budgetary authority seldom comes into play, except as a side issue or in an advisory capacity.

In other cases, the principal may initiate the establishment of a School Improvement Team. Lacking the formal authority vested by the Board of Education or the State Education Department, the SIT then reverts to an advisory capacity and has decision making authority similar to that of Principal's Advisory Council or the Instructional Support Team. It recommends decisions to the faculty as a whole. Faculty decisions are forwarded to the principal and then on to the superintendent and Board of Education.

The SIT increases the professional power of teachers through the school improvement team. Unlike the Instructional Support Team, the SIT does not necessarily have an impact on classroom related factors within the Kanter framework. Although task interdependence is increased through the adoption of common goals and school-wide improvement programs, teacher to teacher interaction, task variety, and general participation in the organization daily professional interaction among teachers is not structured into the modelas it is in the IST. Thus, the SIT overlaps with the two previously discussed models on different dimensions. It retains the school-wide instructional focus of the Instructional Support Team, but lacks its ongoing sharing and joint problem solving around instruction. The SIT shares the school-wide participation, more general collegial interaction, expansion of information networks, and periodic participation patterns consistent with the Principals' Advisory Council.

## Lead Teacher Committee

Purpose. The Lead Teacher model proposes the most radical change in the organizational structure of schools. Currently, the literature on this model is limited to prescriptive proposals (see Carnegie Forum, 1986; Dreyfuss & Whipple, 1987; McDonald, 1987) and contractual agreements setting up modified forms of this model (Rochester, 1987). The expressed purpose of the Lead Teacher model is to improve educational outcomes for children by increasing the utilization of the expertise of professional staff and by widening accountability within the school site beyond the principal.

Role of teachers and the principal. This model formalizes the involvement of teachers and the principal in the decision making process through contractual agreement. Although there is no one Lead Teacher model, some general features can be described. Embedded within this model of teacher involvement is an assumption that the duly elected Board of Education has delegated formal authority to the school site, and more specifically to the Lead Teacher Committee or Instructional Leadership Board. Thus, unlike the other models in which the power held by teachers is generally informally negotiated and in many istances advisory, this model vests the decision making body within the school with the ability to make instructionally related decisions. It should be noted that some versions of this model would give the teachers more formal authority than is currently possessed by principals.

Lead Teachers receive special assignment to provide instructional leadership through a combination of roles that may include induction and coaching of beginning teachers, mentoring, and leadership for school-wide instructional and curricular decision making. In Rochester, New York negotiated teacher contract describes the role of the Lead Teacher to:

> Include, but not be limited to, the following instruction-related or profession-related functions; consulting teachers in the PAR Internship and Intervention Program; adjunct faculty at schools of education in local colleges/universities; curriculum specialists; staff development specialists; test/exam specialists; curriculum specialists; demonstration teachers. Lead Teachers shall accept assignments, meeting the District's instructional needs (Rochester Board of Education, 1987).

In Rochester, Lead Teachers will teach 50% of the time, and as indicated in the contract language, take some of the most difficult assignments if that is where the districts needs are greatest.

Involvement in instructional leadership in some of the Lead Teacher plans goes beyond new roles as curriculum, staff development, instructional specialists. In some plans, Lead Teachers also serve a leadership function as part of a school-wide committee which oversees the educational program. This leadership role represents a formal voice in policy making at the school site. The leadership function of the Lead Teachers on this committee differs conceptually from those discussed previously in terms of the degree of authority vested in the committee and in the formal relationship between the principal and the teachers.

In some plans, the principal retains many management decisions but now shares instructional and personnel decisions with a group of lead teacher. The degree and purview of the principal's decision making authority varies. Similarly, the manner in which the Lead Teacher or Committee of Lead Teachers exercise authority can vary. For illustrative purposes, we show how these responsibilities might be divided between a Committee of Lead Teachers and the principal in Figure Two.

Figure 2
Instructional Leadership Board Model

Board of Education

Superintendent of Schools

| Managerial Director (Principal) | Instructional Board or Director |
|---|---|
| * Budget | * Staff Development |
| * Building Maintenance | * Evaluation |
| * Transportation | * Curriculum |
| * Safety | * Personnel |
| * Payroll | * Pupil Personnel Services |
| * Food Services | * Inst'l Budget Allocations |
| * Communication | * Research and Development |
| * Public Relations | * Communications |
| * Personnel | * Media Services |
| * Discipline | * Discipline |
| | * Public relations |

Directors are non-voting consultants in parallel areas
(MacDonald, 1987)

In this hypothetical Lead Teacher model, developed from descriptions of proposed plans, the school is to governed by an Instructional Leadership Board (ILB) which consists of Lead Teachers selected upon nomination by the professional staff and subject to approval by the superintendent and the Board of Education. The ILB elects the Instructional Director who chairs the ILB, is full time, and has the highest salary in the school. The Director serves a minimum term of two years and is chosen from the membership of the ILB including the Principal, who serves as a non-voting member or consultant.

The Instructional Leadership Board is responsible for the overall leadership of the building and the delegation of instructional functions to individual Lead Teachers. Responsibility for one or more functions may be combined (see Figure Two). Each LEAD Teacher has authority and responsibility for a designated area(s) and serves as a voting member of the Instructional Board of the school. The Instructional Director is a full-time person who serves as Chair of the ILB and coordinates the overall day-to-day instructional services of the school. The Principal is selected upon nomination by the professional staff and approved by the Superintendent and Board of Education. He/she is responsible for management functions of the school and serves as a facilitator for the ILB.

Impact on teachers. It is difficult to speculate on all of the consequences of the Lead Teacher model without knowing the specific details of the plan. It is possible, however, to infer from the broad outlines of the model a significant change in the roles of teachers and principals. The

differentiated role structure in the school would conceivably lead to the generation of greater power among teachers by increasing: 1) the task variety among teachers, 2) the flexibility around the use of people and other resources, 3) the rewards for and likelihood for innovation, 4) communication among professional staff, 5) publicity about job activities, 6) task interdependence, 7) contact with senior officials, 8) participation in meetings conferences and problem-solving task forces etc. Teachers would have greater control over others outside the immediate work unit (i.e., the classroom).

## Discussion

In this paper we presented four organizational models for structuring teacher involvement in school-wide decision making. The emergence of and interest in these models is related to two developments: the perceived unattractiveness of teaching as a professional career and the poor performance of students on a variety of measures of student learning. From our perspective the utility of these models must be measured against their prospects for addressing these conditions.

The argument for teacher empowerment and the attendant expansion of professional roles for teachers contends that such developments will generate greater instructional leadership of the type that results in more effective schools. This means the development of a common mission, greater coordination of the school-wide program, and increased consistency across the school with respect to norms and expectations. Expanded opportunities for teacher leadership will bring much needed, but often overlooked, expertise into play.

As a means of analyzing the four models in terms of their potential for bringing about these changes, we drew upon Kanter's framework of factors associated with power and powerlessness in organizations. We gauged each model conceptually in terms of its potential impact on the factors which influence the power relationships in organizations. A summary of our analysis is contained in Figure Three.

As noted in section two of this paper, Power in Organizations, the traditional teacher role generates a high degree of powerlessness among the professional staff. Little formal authority is vested in teachers with respect to school-wide decison making. While it is true that teachers can impede or halt the implementation of policies or programs with which they are at odds, it is also true that the organizational structure of schools limits the productive power of teachers. That is, traditionally teachers have limited recourse to those factors which enable workers to produce positive change in organizations. This was portrayed earlier in Figure One in which the profile of the teacher working within the traiditional organizational structure reflected powerlessness across almost all dimensions of the framework.

In Figure Three traditional teacher role is compared with that of teachers working under effectively functioning alternative organizational models of school-wide decision making. The same power framework displayed in Figure One is used to compare the teacher roles on each factor. In Figure Two, a "0" represents no change from the traditional teacher role; a "1" represents a moderate positive change; a "2" represents a strong

positive change. Positive in these cases means in the direction of greater power.

The analysis represented in Figure Three suggests that each of the alternative models, when effectively implemented, should result in greater "empowerment" for teachers than under the traditional school structure. Despite this general statement, our discussions of the models in section three if this paper suggested substantial differences among the models in terms of potential impact. In particular, the degree of formal authority vested and the purpose of the decision making body appeared to influence the nature and degree of "empowerment" and potential instructional leadership.

Not surprisingly, the two models in which teachers are vested with formally delegated authority (i.e., the Lead Teacher Committee and, in some cases, the School Improvement Team) also provide teachers with significant access to power. It is interesting to note, however, that in spite of the fact that the Instructional Support Team has less formal authority than either the SIT or the Lead Teacher Committee, it has signficant potential for increasing teacher instructional leadership. In fact, it may generate greater productive power and instructional leadership than either the SIT or the Lead Teacher and with less pressure on the organization for change.

This analysis of alternative models emphasizes the limitations of the Principals' Advisory Council because of its non-instructional focus and its dependence upon principal delegation for its authority. Despite these limitations, this model can make an effective contribution to promoting faculty involvement. It does not, however, appear to be a significant vehicle for promoting instructional leadership, one of the conditions sought after in this analysis.

This discussion of alternative models for involving teachers in decision making remained at a conceptual level. We are under no illusions that this conceptual analysis of these models can replace an empirical study of the impact of each variety on teachers principals, the organization, and students. It is hoped, however, that this explication of these models from the perspective of organizational power may assist in making choices in organizational design that fit purpose with structure.

Figure 3
Ways Organizational Factors Contribute to
the Power or Powerlessness of Teachers and Principals

| Factors Influencing Power | Traditional Teacher Role | Principal Advisory Council | Inst'l Support Team | School Impr't Team | Lead Teacher Committee |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Established Routines | many | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Task Variety | low | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Rewards for predicata-bility | many | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rewards for Unusual Performance | few | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Flexibility around use of People | low | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Approvals needed for Nonroutine Decisions | many | 0 | 0 | 0/1 | 1 |
| Publicity About Job Activities | low | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Relation of Tasks to Current Problem Areas | peri-pheral | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Focus of Tasks | inside work unit | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Interpersonal Contact on Job | low | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Contact with Senior Officials | low | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Participation in Programs Conferences & Meetings | low | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Participation in Problem-solving Task Forces | low | 1/2 | 2 | 1/2 | 1/2 |

0 = no change from traditional model
1 = moderate positive change from traditional model
2 = strong positive change from traditional model
(Adapted from Kanter, 1979)

## References


Azumi, Jann E. & Madhere, Serge (April 1983). Professionalism, Power and Performance: The Relationship Between Administrative Control, Teacher Conformity, and Student Achievement. Revised version of paper presented at American Educational Research Association, Montreal.

Berman, P. & McLaughlin, M. (1978). Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change: Volume IV. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corp.

Bridges, E. (1978). The Nature of Leadership. In L. Cunningham, W. Hack, and R. Nystrand (Eds.), Educational Administration: The Developing Decades. Berkeley: McCutchan.

Bridges, E. (summer 1982). Research on the School Administrator: The State of the Art 1968-1982. Educational Administration Quarterly.

Carnegie Forum On Education and The Economy (May, 1986). A Report on the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. Washington D.C.

Cuban, L. (April 24, 1984). The Sham of School Reform. San Jose Mercury, 1-2.

Cuban, L. (1987). The Practice of Leadership in Schools: The Managerial Imperative. Albany: SUNY Press.

Davies, Don (Ed.). (1987). Schools and Communities Working Together. Boston: Institute for Responsive Education.

Dreyfuss, Gerald O. & Whipple, Ida, (October 1987). A Historical Perspective School-Based Management/Shared Decision-Making. Dade County Public Schools, Miami, Florida,

French, J. & Raven, B. (1968). The Sources of Social Power, In Group Dynamics: Research and Theory, eds. D. Cartwright and A. Zander. Evanston, IL: Row Paterson Corp.

Furtwengler, Willis J. (April 1986). Reaching Success Through Involvement: Implementation Strategy for Creating and Maintaining Effective Schools. paper presented at the annual meeting of The American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Guditus, C. & Zirkel, P. (1979-80). Bases of Supervisory Power Among Public School Principals. Administrator's Notebook, 28(4), 1-4.

Lancto, Robert M. (Winter, 1987-88). An Inquiry: Shared Decision-Making. Journal, SAANYS.

Leithwood, K. & Montgomery, (1982). The Role of the Elementary School in Program Implementation. Review of Educational Research

Little, J., Long, C. & Guilkey-Amado, J. (January, 1986). Expanding Professional Collaboration in Schools: Can Districts Organize Leadership By Teachers? San Francisco: Far West Lab.

Little, J. W. & Long, C. Cases in Emerging Leadership by Teachers: The School-Level Instructional Support Team. San Francisco: Far West Lab.

MacDonald, R. (Ed.). (1987). Report on the Select Seminar on School Building Leadership and Management. Albany, NY: Capitol Area School Development Council.

Marburger, Carl School Improvement: Shared decisions at the local level. Committee for Citizens in Education.

March, J. (February, 1978). American Public School Administration: A Short Analysis. School Review, 217-250.

McLaughlin, M. & Marsh, D. (1978). Staff Development and School Change. Teachers College Record, 80(1), 70-93.

Mechanic, D. (December, 1962). Sources of Power of Lower Level Participants in Complex Organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 7, 349-364.

Mintzberg, H. (1983). Power in and around Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Murphy, J., Hallinger, P., & Miller, S. (Winter, 1987). Barriers to Instructional Leadership. The Canadian Administrator.

O'Rourke, P. (Spring, 1987). Shared Decision Making at the School Site: Moving Toward A Professional Model. American Educator.

Pfeffer, J. (1981). Power in Organizations. Marshfield, MA: Pitman.

Porter, L., Allen, R., & Angle, H. (1981). The Politics of Upward Influence in Organizations. In L. Cummings and B. Staw (Eds.), Research in Organizational Behavior, Vol. 3: Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Richardson, Don H. (1987). Shared Decision-Making: Conflict or Collaboration. Ardsley, NY: Westchester Principals' Center.

Rochester Public Schools. (1987). Contractual Agreement between the United Federation of Teachers of Rochester and the Board of Education of the City Schools of Rochester New York.

Scott, J. & Smith, S. (1987). From Isolation to Collaboration: Improving the Work Environment of Teaching North West Regional Educational Laboratory, University of Oregon.

Trumbull, D. (1987). Evaluation of the Principal's Advisory Council at Valhalla High School. Ardsley NY: Westchester Principals' Center.

Weick, K. (February, 1982). Administering Education in Loosely Coupled Schools. Phi Delta Kappan.